



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,493	02/12/2004	Ashvin Joseph Mathew	MS#304548.01 (5096)	5231

38779 7590 06/11/2009
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)
100 NORTH BROADWAY
17TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

BLACK, LINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2159

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/11/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/777,493	Applicant(s) MATHEW ET AL.	
	Examiner LINH BLACK	Art Unit 2159	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,10-13,16,17,19-24,27,28,30,31 and 36-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,10-13,16,17,19-24,27,28,30,31 and 36-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/5/08,6/5/09</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 16-17, 19-24, 27-28, 30-31 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 11, 23-24, 28 are the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 16-17, 19-24, 27-28, 30-31, 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al. (2002/0147810) in view of Elliott et al. (US 20020064149).

As per claim 1, Traversat et al. teach

a method of providing from a centralized location access control to a resource for one or more users - paragraphs 21 (discovery in a peer-to-peer environment may be based on centralized discovery with a centralized index), 71, 73-74 (implementing a centralized, client-server model based on the core components), and 77.

Art Unit: 2159

receiving at the centralized location an authorization request from a first entity to issue authorization data for the one or more users based on roles associated with the users as part of an organization model - pars. 162, 368, 420, and 440.

authorization data is required by a second entity for allowing the first entity to access a resource controlled by the second entity – pars. 78 (facilities provided as services in the service layer may include...authentication...peer group membership), 102 (each peer group may have different policies to authorize a peer to become a rendezvous peer), 328, 439.

responsive to the received authorization request, issuing the authorization data from the centralized location to the first entity – pars. 73-74, 439-440.

wherein the first entity provides the issued authorization data to the second entity, said authorization data including an expression identifying the resource by a resource name and by at least one property associated with the resource to conditionally define access to the resource – pars. 72, 159, 331, 422-426.

said authorization data further including validation information; receiving at the centralized location a validation request from the second entity to validate the issued authorization data that was provided to the second entity by the first entity...validating the issued authorization data based on the validation information included therein included therein – pars. 73-74, 162, 422-423, 439, 455. However, Traversat seems not explicitly disclose sending from the centralized location a response to the second entity indicating ...Elliott discloses a centralized message database offerings for MCI's business customers –

Art Unit: 2159

paragraphs 1289, 1567, 1578; responses from the ISP to external requests - pars. 944, 1296, 1389, 1579-1581. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Traversat's teaching with Elliott's teaching in order to allow a centralized location to response to requests from other attached locations in order to manage and serve users.

As per claim 4, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the request and issuing the authorization data occur over a secure sockets layer – pars. 418-419, 437.

As per claim 5, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the request and issuing the authorization data occur over a network such as the Internet – pars. 77-78.

As per claim 6, Traversat et al. teach

creating the expression identifying the resource in authorization data in response to the received authorization request – pars. 30, 325, 364.

As per claim 7, Traversat et al. teach

Art Unit: 2159

encrypting the created expression – pars. 78, 94, 139.

As per claims 11 and 23, Traversat et al. teach

a method for validating at the centralized location authorization data to provide access to a resource for one or more users - paragraphs 21 (discovery in a peer-to-peer environment may be based on centralized discovery with a centralized index), 71, 73-74 (implementing a centralized, client-server model based on the core components), and 77.

receiving at the centralized location an authorization request from a client to issue authorization data for the one or more users based on roles associated with the users – pars. 73-74, 162, 368, and 440.

wherein said authorization data is required by an affiliate server for allowing the client to access a resource controlled by said affiliate/second/member/partner server - pars. 78 (facilities provided as services in the service layer may include...authentication...peer group membership), 102 (each peer group may have different policies to authorize a peer to become a rendezvous peer), 328, 439.

responsive to the received authorization request, generating at the centralized location an authorization token – pars. 74, 139, 439.

Art Unit: 2159

having a header field (pars. 132, 144, 355), a source field, and a claim field, said header field representing validation information, said source field representing the identity of the user (pars. 242-246), said claim field specifying the resource conditionally, said claim field including an expression identifying the resource by a resource name (pars. 113, 117, 159, 172)and by at least one property associated with the resource to conditionally define access to the resource – pars. 72, 107, 139, 162.

sending the authorization token from the centralized location to the client, wherein the client provides the authorization token to the affiliate server – pars. 74, 139, 439.

receiving at the centralized location over a secure sockets layer a validation request from the affiliate server to validate the authorization token, said receiving the validation request comprises receiving a data packet according to the SOAP, and further comprising extracting the authorization token from the received data packet – pars. 72, 355, 419-425.

retrieving validation information from the header of the received authorization data; evaluating the retrieved validation information to determine a validation status of the received authorization token – pars. 162, 206, 439-440.

sending a response to the affiliate server indicating a determined validation status responsive to said evaluating the retrieved validation information – pars. 325, 352, 355. However, Traversat seems not explicitly disclose sending from the centralized location a response to the second entity indicating ...Elliott

Art Unit: 2159

discloses a centralized message database offerings for MCI's business customers – paragraphs 1289, 1567, 1578; responses from the ISP to external requests - pars. 944, 1296, 1389, 1579-1581. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Traversat's teaching with Elliott's teaching in order to allow a centralized location to response to requests from other attached locations in order to manage and serve users.

As per claim 12, Traversat et al. teach

evaluating the expression to identify the resource – par. 72.

As per claim 13, Traversat et al. teach

extracting a target scope from the received authorization data, said extracted target scope identifying the resource – pars. 71, 110-112.

As per claim 16, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the validation request including the authorization token occurs over a network such as the Internet – pars. 77-78.

Art Unit: 2159

As per claim 17, Traversat et al. teach

decrypting the received authorization data token – pars. 139, 441.

As per claim 19, Traversat et al. teach

retrieving a signature from the header of the received authorization data – pars. 94, 139, 143.

As per claim 20, Traversat et al. teach

determining that the retrieved signature is invalid, and wherein sending the response comprises sending a response indicating the invalidity of the received authorization data token – pars. 139, 426, claim 12.

As per claim 21, Traversat et al. teach

wherein retrieving the validation information comprises retrieving an expiration date from the header of the received authorization token – pars. 451-453.

and wherein evaluating the retrieved validation information comprises comparing the retrieved expiration date to a current time stamp to determine if the received authorization token has expired – pars. 439-440.

Art Unit: 2159

As per claim 22, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the received authorization token has been determined to be expired, and further comprising sending a response indicating the invalidity of the received authorization token – pars. 152, 451, 453.

As per claim 24, Traversat et al. teach

receive an authorization request from a first entity to issue authorization data for the one or more users from the centralized location based on roles associated with the users - pars. 21, 73-74, 162, 368, and 440.

wherein said authorization data is required by a second entity for allowing the client to access a resource controlled by said second entity - pars. 72-74, 78.

an authorization component adapted to issue at the centralized location the requested authorization data for the users based on the roles associated with the users – pars. 73-74, 162, 368, and 440.

an expression identifying a resource by a resource name and by a property associated with the resource and said authorization data including the validation information – pars. 72, 159, 331, 422-426.

receive a validation request from the second entity, said validation request including the authorization data – pars. 162, 175, 439.

Art Unit: 2159

a parser component adapted to retrieve validation information from the received authorization data – pars. 30, 121, 219.

a validation component adapted to evaluate the retrieved validation information – pars. 162, 439.

wherein the interface component is further adapted to send a response indicating the validation status of the received authorization data responsive to said evaluating the retrieved validation information – pars. 81, 101, 323-325.

However, Traversat seems not explicitly disclose sending from the centralized location a response to the second entity indicating ...Elliott discloses a centralized message database offerings for MCI's business customers – paragraphs 1289, 1567, 1578; responses from the ISP to external requests - pars. 944, 1296, 1389, 1579-1581. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Traversat's teaching with Elliott's teaching in order to allow a centralized location to response to requests from other attached locations in order to manage and serve users.

As per claim 27, Traversat et al. teach

a scope component to evaluate the expression to identify the resource – par. 72.

As per claim 28, Traversat et al. teach

Art Unit: 2159

a memory area accessible from the centralized location for storing authorization data for use in providing a first entity access to a resource that is controlled by a second entity – pars. 72-74, 77-78, 139.

said authorization data including an expression identifying the resource by a resource name and by at least one property associated with the resource – pars. 72, 159, 331, 422-426.

...issuing from the centralized location responsive to a request from the first entity, the authorization data for a user based on a role associated with the user and for validating, in response to a request from the second entity, the authorization data to provide access to the resource – pars. 73-74, 162, 175, 439.

As per claim 30, Traversat et al. teach

evaluating the expression to identify the resource – par. 72.

As per claim 31, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the authorization data comprises a token – pars. 139, 439.

As per claim 36, Traversat et al. teach

Art Unit: 2159

wherein the first entity is an application program - pars. 124, 362, 458.

As per claim 37, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the first entity is a computing device – pars. 88-89, 97, 328.

As per claim 38, Traversat et al. teach

generating a signature based on the expression identifying the resource, and

wherein the validation information includes said generated signature – pars. 94,

139, 451-453.

As per claim 39, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the validation information includes an expiration date – pars. 451-453.

As per claim 40, Traversat et al. teach

a site identifier identifying the first entity - pars. 72, 88-89, 97, 328.

As per claim 41, Traversat et al. teach

Art Unit: 2159

retrieving the validation information from the received authorization data – pars.

72, 101, 121, 422-423, 441.

evaluating the retrieved validation information - pars. 162, 439.

sending a response to the second entity indicating the validation status of the
received

authorization data responsive to said evaluating the retrieved validation
information – pars. 325, 352, 355.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the Applicant's argument on the newly added limitations "at the centralized location", "sending from a centralized location...", Examiner provided a new ground of rejection, please see the above. However, Traversat does disclose in paragraphs 21 (discovery in a peer-to-peer environment may be based on centralized discovery with a centralized index), 73-74 (implementing a centralized, client-server model based on the core components).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH BLACK whose telephone number is 571-272-4106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

Art Unit: 2159

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trujillo can be reached on 571-272-3677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HUNG Q. PHAM/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2159
June 8, 2009

LINH BLACK
Examiner
Art Unit 2159